The Command Paradox: Executive Authority, Military Ethics, and the Brink of Total War in the 2026 Iran Crisis

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

April 8, 2026

On the evening of April 7, 2026, the United States stood at the threshold of a conflict that threatened to redefine global warfare. President Donald Trump's ultimatum—the promised "annihilation" of Iranian civilization should the Strait of Hormuz remain closed—set an 8:00 p.m. ET deadline that many feared would mark the onset of nuclear exchange. However, the anticipated strike did not materialize. Instead, a sudden, Pakistani-mediated ceasefire was announced, leaving a vacuum of information that has since been filled by reports of a profound rupture between the White House and the Central Command (CENTCOM). As rumors circulate regarding a high-level refusal of orders based on the legality of targeting civilian infrastructure, the nation faces a dual crisis: a fragile peace abroad and a constitutional storm at home. This paper examines the intersection of executive authority, military ethics, and the mental fitness of the Commander-in-Chief. It analyzes whether the current de-escalation is a masterstroke of "Madman Theory" diplomacy or the result of a military establishment acting as a final check against perceived executive instability. In an era where the speed of modern warfare leaves little room for error, the events of April 2026 force a critical reevaluation of the safeguards governing the most powerful military on Earth.

Keywords: presidential war powers, civilian-military relations, CENTCOM, Iran nuclear crisis 2026, 25th Amendment, international humanitarian law, Pakistan mediation, strategic de-escalation, command ethics, executive mental capacity, Middle East conflict, constitutional law.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

Outline

1. The April 7 Ultimatum: A Timeline of Escalation

2. The Legal Framework of Executive War Powers and the UCMJ

3. The Refusal Narrative: Investigating the CENTCOM-White House Standoff

4. International Humanitarian Law and the "Annihilation" Doctrine

5. The Pakistani Accord: Diplomatic Breakthrough or Tactical Delay?

6. The Israeli-Lebanon Disconnect: Fragility of the Regional Ceasefire

7. Cognitive Capacity and the Commander-in-Chief: The 25th Amendment Debate

8. Nuclear Brinkmanship in the 21st Century: Protocols and Pressure

9. Historical Precedents of Military Insubordination and Their Modern Echoes

10. The Role of Congress in Preventing Unilateral Escalation

11. Geopolitical Realignment: The Sino-Russian Response to US Volatility

12. Conclusion: Reevaluating the Safeguards of the Republic

References

Art

1. The April 7 Ultimatum: A Timeline of Escalation

The Lead-up: Five Weeks of Attrition

The crisis of April 2026 did not emerge from a vacuum but was the culmination of thirty-five days of intensifying kinetic exchanges between the United States, Israel, and the Islamic Republic of Iran. Following a series of naval skirmishes in the Persian Gulf and a significant cyber-offensive that temporarily crippled the port of Bandar Abbas, the conflict transitioned into a sustained aerial campaign. By early April, the regional economy had ground to a halt as the Strait of Hormuz remained effectively shuttered by Iranian naval mines and anti-ship missile batteries. Global oil prices had spiked to unprecedented levels, and international diplomatic efforts through the United Nations had repeatedly stalled. The White House, frustrated by what it termed the mullahs' stubbornness, adopted a strategy of maximum pressure that prioritized the total degradation of Iran's military capabilities. However, as the campaign stretched into its second month, the lack of a definitive Iranian surrender began to test the patience of the executive branch, setting the stage for a more radical shift in military objectives.

The F-15 Incident and the Rescue of April 5

The catalyst for the final escalatory spiral was the downing of an American F-15 fighter jet over Iranian territory on Friday, April 3. Despite prior claims from the administration that Iranian air defenses had been neutralized, the aircraft was struck by a shoulder-fired missile, forcing the two-person crew to eject into hostile terrain. The subsequent forty-eight hours saw one of the most complex and dangerous search-and-rescue operations in modern military history. Over 170 aircraft and 200 ground troops were mobilized to retrieve the pilot and weapon systems officer. While the mission was ultimately successful, it resulted in significant American hardware losses, including the destruction of a C-130 and damage to an A-10 ground-attack jet. Publicly, the President touted the rescue as a display of American "audacity," but privately, the incident was viewed as an intolerable embarrassment that exposed vulnerabilities in the U.S. air superiority narrative. The White House's internal rhetoric shifted from tactical containment to the necessity of a permanent, catastrophic solution to the Iranian threat.

The April 7 Morning Ultimatum

On the morning of Tuesday, April 7, the rhetorical threshold was crossed. In a series of social media posts beginning at approximately 6:45 a.m. ET, the President issued a direct ultimatum to the Iranian leadership. He declared that if the Strait of Hormuz was not "completely, immediately, and safely" opened to international traffic by 8:00 p.m. that evening, the United States would initiate a strike of "unprecedented magnitude." Unlike previous threats targeting military assets, this ultimatum explicitly broadened the target list to include civilian infrastructure. The President stated that the United States was prepared to "annihilate a whole

civilization," specifically naming power plants, bridges, and communications hubs as primary targets. The shift in language from military "neutralization" to civil "annihilation" sent shockwaves through the global community, prompting immediate condemnations from the Vatican and several European allies, who argued that such a strike would constitute a violation of the Geneva Conventions.

The Civilization Doctrine and the 8:00 p.m. Deadline

As the 8:00 p.m. deadline approached, the atmosphere in Washington and Tehran was one of near-total mobilization. In the United States, the announcement prompted a mass exodus from major metropolitan areas near potential retaliatory sites, while in Iran, residents in Tehran and Isfahan reportedly sought shelter in subway tunnels and basements. Within the Pentagon, the tension reached a breaking point. While the White House insisted that the "Civilization Doctrine" was a necessary deterrent to break the Iranian will, legal advisors within the Department of Defense and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were reportedly engaged in heated debates regarding the legality of the proposed target list. The moral and legal implications of striking non-military infrastructure—which would inevitably lead to massive civilian casualties—created a rift in the chain of command that was palpable to those inside the E-Ring. As the clock ticked down, the world prepared for a conflict that many feared would inevitably turn nuclear.

The Pakistani Mediation and the 7:59 p.m. Reversal

In a turn of events that defied all prevailing intelligence assessments, the 8:00 p.m. deadline passed without a launch. At 7:59 p.m., just sixty seconds before the scheduled escalation, the White House announced that a breakthrough had been achieved. Through the frantic mediation of Pakistani Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif and Field Marshal Asim Munir, the Iranian government had reportedly submitted a ten-point peace proposal that met the President’s core demands. The deal included the immediate reopening of the Strait of Hormuz and a two-week "pause" in hostilities to facilitate further negotiations. The President immediately framed the reversal as a historic triumph of his negotiation style, asserting that his "unlimited pressure" had forced the Iranian regime to blink. However, the sudden de-escalation left many questions unanswered, particularly regarding the role of the military leadership in the final hour. While the White House presented the ceasefire as a voluntary executive choice, reports began to surface that the decision was influenced by a deep-seated reluctance, or outright refusal, within CENTCOM to execute the "annihilation" orders as originally drafted.

2. The Legal Framework of Executive War Powers and the UCMJ

The constitutional authority governing the use of military force resides in the delicate tension between Article I, which grants Congress the power to declare war, and Article II, which designates the President as the Commander-in-Chief. In the context of the 2026 Iran crisis, this tension has reached a historic zenith. Following the failure of the March 18 Senate vote to limit executive war powers, the administration has operated under an expansive interpretation of the Commander-in-Chief clause, arguing that the immediate threat to global energy security posed by the closure of the Strait of Hormuz grants the President unilateral authority to engage in "punitive" strikes. However, statutory limits such as the War Powers Resolution of 1973 theoretically require congressional notification and authorization for sustained hostilities. The legal debate in Washington currently centers on whether the "annihilation" of civilian infrastructure constitutes a standard military operation or a departure into territory that requires a formal declaration of war or a specific authorization for use of military force.

Crucial to the reported friction between the White House and the Pentagon is the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), which provides the legal backbone for the chain of command. While Articles 90, 91, and 92 of the UCMJ mandate that service members obey the lawful orders of their superiors, including the President, they also establish a profound moral and legal boundary: the duty to disobey an unlawful order. An order is considered unlawful if it directs a subordinate to commit a crime, such as a violation of the laws of armed conflict. In the hours preceding the April 7 deadline, the primary legal question was whether an order to destroy non-military power plants and bridges violated the Principle of Distinction established under International Humanitarian Law. This principle, codified in Protocol I of the Geneva Conventions, prohibits the intentional targeting of objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population.

The role of the Judge Advocate General (JAG) and the legal review process within the Department of Defense serves as the primary safeguard against the execution of illegal commands. Every target list generated by a combatant command like CENTCOM undergoes a rigorous vetting process to ensure compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict. Reports suggest that the 2026 "Civilization Doctrine" presented a unique challenge to this process, as the targets selected by the White House were reportedly purely civilian in nature, lacking a clear "dual-use" military justification. When a President demands the destruction of a target that his legal advisors deem illegal, the military officer is placed in a "Command Paradox." To follow the order is to risk prosecution for war crimes; to refuse it is to risk a court-martial for insubordination. This legal stalemate is believed to be the catalyst for the "slow roll" of military preparations that occurred on the evening of April 7.

Furthermore, the domestic legal implications of the President's mental state add a layer of complexity to the war powers debate. The 25th Amendment, specifically Section 4, provides a mechanism for the removal of a President who is "unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office." While this has historically been viewed as a medical or physical provision, current congressional arguments suggest that an order to commit massive, illegal violence could be interpreted as a failure of cognitive or moral capacity. The legal framework of 2026 thus faces a dual-track challenge: resolving the limits of kinetic authority in a "gray zone" conflict while simultaneously determining the threshold at which a Commander-in-Chief's strategic erraticism becomes a constitutional incapacity. The resolution of these questions will likely define the boundaries of executive power for the remainder of the century.

3. The Refusal Narrative: Investigating the CENTCOM-White House Standoff

Initial Reports of Friction at MacDill and the Pentagon

The hours between the issuance of the morning ultimatum and the 8:00 p.m. deadline were characterized by a series of leaks suggesting a profound disconnect between the tactical directives issued by the White House and the operational readiness of the military. Anonymous sources within the Pentagon began reporting that Admiral Brad Cooper, the Commander of CENTCOM, had requested a formal, written legal justification for the proposed targeting of Iranian power grids and transportation networks. This request was not framed as an outright refusal but rather as a procedural necessity to ensure compliance with the Uniform Code of Military Justice. However, in the high-stakes environment of a nuclear-adjacent standoff, this demand for legal clarity was interpreted by many in the West Wing as a strategic delay. The narrative of a "slow roll" gained momentum as it became clear that the specific coordinates for civilian infrastructure targets had not been moved into the active fire-control systems of the carrier strike groups positioned in the Arabian Sea.

Admiral Brad Cooper and the Principle of Proportionality

Admiral Cooper, known for his pragmatic approach to maritime security, reportedly became the central figure in this administrative standoff. Intelligence circles suggest that Cooper held a secure video teleconference with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Dan Caine, during which they discussed the long-term geopolitical consequences of "annihilating" the Iranian civil sector. The primary concern was the Principle of Proportionality: the legal requirement that the harm caused to civilians must not be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. Cooper reportedly argued that while the destruction of Iranian naval assets was a clear military objective, the demolition of civilian bridges and electricity plants offered no immediate tactical advantage in reopening the Strait of Hormuz and would instead

radicalize the Iranian populace and alienate regional partners. This internal pushback, labeled by some as a "conscientious pause," is what critics and supporters alike have termed the CENTCOM refusal.

The White House Counter-Narrative and Denials

In the immediate aftermath of the ceasefire announcement, the White House moved aggressively to dismantle the refusal narrative. Press Secretary responses and social media statements from the President insisted that the military was in a state of "total and absolute readiness" to execute the mission. The administration's position is that the military serves the executive branch and that any suggestion of hesitation is a fabrication by political opponents. According to this view, the President's threat was a calculated psychological operation that achieved its goal without a single shot being fired. They point to the Pakistani mediation as the true catalyst for the ceasefire, arguing that the Iranian regime caved specifically because they knew the U.S. military was prepared to carry out the President's orders to the letter. This counter-narrative frames the President not as a leader facing a mutiny, but as a master negotiator who knew exactly how far to push the brink before pulling back.

The Implications for Civilian Control of the Military

The investigation into the reported standoff raises fundamental questions about the health of civilian-military relations in 2026. If Admiral Cooper and General Caine did indeed withhold or delay the execution of a presidential order, it represents a historic challenge to the principle of civilian control. Conversely, if the orders were truly unlawful, the officers were fulfilling their constitutional duty to uphold the law over personal loyalty to the Commander-in-Chief. The "refusal narrative" thus serves as a Rorschach test for the American public: it is either seen as a heroic intervention by "the adults in the room" to prevent a war crime, or as a dangerous subversion of the democratic mandate by an unelected military elite. Regardless of the veracity of the leaks, the perception of a standoff has permanently altered the trust dynamic within the National Security Council and has provided the primary impetus for the emergency congressional sessions currently being convened in Washington.

4. International Humanitarian Law and the "Annihilation" Doctrine

Defining the Annihilation Doctrine in Modern Warfare

The rhetoric emerging from the White House in the spring of 2026 has introduced a concept that legal scholars have termed the Annihilation Doctrine. This strategic posture moves beyond the traditional military goal of neutralizing an enemy's ability to wage war and enters the realm of dismantling the functional capacity of a nation-state to sustain civilian life. In the context of

the April 7 ultimatum, the doctrine was articulated as a direct response to Iranian non-compliance regarding the Strait of Hormuz. By threatening to destroy bridges, power plants, and water treatment facilities, the administration signaled a departure from the precision-strike paradigms that have defined American interventionism since the first Gulf War. Historically, American military doctrine has sought to minimize collateral damage, at least in its public-facing legal justifications. The 2026 Annihilation Doctrine, however, explicitly embraces the destruction of the civilian fabric as a tool of psychological and strategic leverage, arguing that the survival of a civilization is a privilege contingent upon its government's cooperation with international demands.

The Principle of Distinction and the Targeting of Civil Infrastructure

At the heart of the legal crisis within the Pentagon is the Principle of Distinction, a cornerstone of International Humanitarian Law codified in the Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols. This principle requires that belligerents at all times distinguish between the civilian population and combatants and between civilian objects and military objectives. An order to target a bridge that is not being used for military transport, or a power plant that provides electricity to hospitals and homes rather than a command-and-control center, is fundamentally at odds with this requirement. Under the 2026 crisis parameters, the target list reportedly provided to CENTCOM included nodes of the Iranian national grid that were purely for domestic consumption. Legal experts within the military's Judge Advocate General Corps have argued that because these objects do not make an effective contribution to military action, their destruction offers no legitimate military advantage that would outweigh the civilian suffering caused. The Annihilation Doctrine thus represents a direct challenge to the definition of a military objective, attempting to broaden the term to include any asset that, if destroyed, would cause a domestic political collapse.

Proportionality and the Specter of Collective Punishment

Even if certain civilian structures could be argued to have dual-use potential, the Principle of Proportionality provides a second, more stringent legal barrier. This rule prohibits attacks where the incidental loss of civilian life or damage to civilian objects would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. In the final hours of the April 7 standoff, the military's internal assessment reportedly concluded that the "civilization" strikes would result in a humanitarian catastrophe—ranging from mass starvation due to the destruction of transport routes to widespread disease following the collapse of the power grid. When the military advantage is merely a "diplomatic concession" or a "show of force," the scale of civilian death inherent in the Annihilation Doctrine becomes legally indefensible. Furthermore, many international observers have characterized the threat as a form of collective punishment, which is explicitly forbidden under Article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention. By holding the entire

Iranian population hostage to the decisions of their leadership, the doctrine undermines the moral and legal standing of the United States as a defender of the rules-based international order.

The Legal Consequences of the Civilization Threat

The issuance of the ultimatum alone has generated significant legal exposure for the administration and the military chain of command. Under international law, the threat to commit a war crime is often treated with the same severity as the act itself in terms of diplomatic and legal repercussions. The "Civilization Doctrine" has prompted calls for the International Criminal Court to open an investigation into the planning stages of the April 7 operation. Domestically, the situation is even more precarious for the officers involved. If a commanding officer were to follow an order that resulted in the mass death of civilians through the destruction of vital infrastructure, they could face prosecution under both the War Crimes Act of 1996 and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The reluctance seen in CENTCOM was not merely a matter of policy disagreement but a calculated effort to avoid personal and institutional criminal liability. The 2026 crisis has demonstrated that while a President may command the nuclear codes, the legal architecture of modern warfare provides a friction point that can, in theory, halt the march toward annihilation. This friction, however, relies entirely on the willingness of subordinates to prioritize their legal and constitutional oaths over executive directives.

5. The Pakistani Accord: Diplomatic Breakthrough or Tactical Delay?

The Mechanics of the Backchannel

The rapid de-escalation that occurred in the final minutes of the April 7 ultimatum was facilitated by a diplomatic backchannel that had been operating in near-total secrecy for several days. Pakistan, maintaining unique strategic ties to both the American defense establishment and the Iranian leadership, emerged as the only viable intermediary capable of navigating the "Civilization Doctrine" crisis. Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif and Field Marshal Asim Munir reportedly acted as the primary conduits, relaying messages between the White House and Tehran’s Supreme National Security Council. The breakthrough began with a frantic series of teleconferences on the morning of April 7, during which the Pakistani leadership urged the President to extend the deadline in exchange for a tangible Iranian concession regarding the Strait of Hormuz. While the administration initially rejected these overtures, the increasing friction within the Pentagon and the looming threat of a constitutional crisis in Washington likely increased the appeal of a mediated "out." The resulting accord, announced just one

minute before the 8:00 p.m. deadline, was the product of a high-stakes diplomatic gamble that prioritized a temporary cessation of hostilities over a final military resolution.

The Ten-Point Proposal: A Blueprint for Peace or a List of Demands?

The centerpiece of the Pakistani mediation was a ten-point proposal submitted by the Iranian government, which the President publicly characterized as a workable basis for a permanent settlement. The document, released in various forms by state media, outlines a comprehensive set of conditions that would fundamentally alter the regional security architecture. Key provisions include a mutual guarantee of non-aggression, the lifting of all primary and secondary U.S. sanctions, and the release of billions in frozen Iranian assets. Most controversially, the proposal demands the recognition of Iran's right to uranium enrichment and the withdrawal of U.S. combat forces from several bases in West Asia. In exchange, Iran has promised the complete and safe reopening of the Strait of Hormuz for the duration of the two-week ceasefire. However, the proposal has already become a source of intense scrutiny due to a linguistic discrepancy: the Farsi version of the document explicitly demands "acceptance of enrichment," a phrase that was notably absent from the English translations provided to Western journalists. This ambiguity suggests that the "breakthrough" may be built on a foundation of strategic misinterpretation, intended to allow both sides to claim a domestic political victory.

The Victory Frame vs. The Tactical Farce

President Trump's immediate reaction to the ceasefire was to frame it as a "total and complete victory" for his administration's maximum pressure strategy. In his public addresses, he asserted that the Iranian regime had "had enough" and was forced to the negotiating table by the credible threat of total destruction. By claiming that all military objectives had already been met or exceeded, the President sought to justify the sudden shift from a posture of annihilation to one of diplomacy. Conversely, critics of the administration, as well as several members of the Congressional opposition, have labeled the ceasefire a farce. They argue that the "victory" is a rhetorical facade designed to mask a collapse in command authority and a lack of a coherent long-term strategy. From this perspective, the ceasefire is not a genuine step toward peace but a tactical retreat necessitated by the military's refusal to execute potentially illegal orders. The discrepancy between the President's triumphant tone and the reality of a continuing Iranian presence in the Strait has led to accusations that the administration is operating in a state of strategic delusion, prioritizing the appearance of success over the complexities of regional stability.

The Strategic Pause: Reloading and Repositioning

Beyond the immediate relief felt by global markets, many military analysts view the two-week ceasefire as a dangerous tactical pause rather than a diplomatic solution. A fourteen-day window provides both the United States and Iran with the opportunity to repair damaged infrastructure, resupply frontline units, and reposition strategic assets. For the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, the pause allows for the clearing of naval mines and the rotation of missile batteries that had been targeted by American and Israeli strikes in March. For the United States, it provides a window to rotate carrier strike groups and address the internal command disputes that paralyzed the Pentagon on April 7. This "reloading phase" suggests that the risk of a return to kinetic conflict remains high, especially if the Islamabad negotiations scheduled for Friday fail to produce a definitive agreement. The temporary nature of the ceasefire, combined with the unresolved status of the nuclear enrichment issue, means that the regional tinderbox remains ready to ignite at the first sign of a diplomatic breakdown. The "Pakistani Accord" may ultimately be remembered not as the end of the war, but as the quiet before an even more devastating storm.

6. The Israeli-Lebanon Disconnect: Fragility of the Regional Ceasefire

The Universal Ceasefire Claim by Pakistan

In the early morning hours of Wednesday, April 8, 2026, Pakistani Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif issued a celebratory statement on social media claiming that the mediation efforts in Islamabad had secured an immediate ceasefire that was effective everywhere. This statement specifically mentioned that the cessation of hostilities extended to Lebanon, where Israeli forces and Hezbollah had been engaged in a brutal ground war for several weeks. From the perspective of the Pakistani mediators, a deal with Iran would be functionally useless if its primary regional ally remained under intense military pressure. The narrative promoted by Islamabad was one of a grand regional bargain that would freeze all fronts of the conflict simultaneously, allowing for a comprehensive cooling of tensions across the Middle East. For a brief window, the international community believed that the "Civilization Doctrine" crisis had been averted not just for Iran, but for the Levant as well.

Jerusalem’s Categorical Denial

This optimism was short-lived. Four hours after the White House announcement and nearly simultaneous with the Pakistani Prime Minister’s statement, the office of Benjamin Netanyahu issued a clarifying directive that sharply contradicted the "universal" nature of the truce. The Israeli Prime Minister’s Office (PMO) stated that while Israel supported President Trump’s decision to suspend strikes against Iran for two weeks, this suspension did not extend to

Lebanon. The Israeli position remains that Hezbollah represents a distinct and existential threat to the northern Galilee region that cannot be resolved through a U.S.-Iran diplomatic "pause." By explicitly excluding Lebanon from the ceasefire, Jerusalem signaled that its kinetic operations—including the ongoing ground maneuvers and aerial bombardments of Beirut—would continue unabated. This disconnect exposed a significant rift between the American-led diplomatic track and the operational realities of the Israeli defense establishment.

The Hezbollah Factor and the Proxy Paradox

The exclusion of Lebanon from the ceasefire creates what strategic analysts call the Proxy Paradox. Iran's submission to the ten-point plan was reportedly predicated on the idea that its "Axis of Resistance" would receive a reprieve from American and Israeli pressure. If Hezbollah continues to face the full weight of the Israel Defense Forces while its patron in Tehran is officially in a ceasefire with Washington, the internal political pressure on the Iranian leadership to resume hostilities will become immense. Hezbollah's leadership has already signaled that it does not consider itself bound by a deal negotiated in Islamabad to which it was not a party. This creates a volatile environment where a single tactical success by Hezbollah or a significant Israeli strike in Lebanon could serve as the "spoiler" that brings the U.S. and Iran back to the brink of total war. The regional ceasefire is, in effect, a house of cards where the foundations in Lebanon remain on fire.

The Communication Gap Between Washington and Jerusalem

The discrepancy between the White House's "Total Victory" narrative and the Israeli PMO's "Lebanon Exclusion" suggests a profound lack of coordination between the two allies. While President Trump has asserted that Israel is fully on board with his 10-point plan, the Israeli statement issued in English—notably not in Hebrew for a domestic audience—suggests that Netanyahu is attempting to manage a delicate balance between pleasing a volatile American President and maintaining his own security mandates. Reports from within the State Department suggest that the U.S. had indeed assured Israel that its "shared goals" regarding Hezbollah would remain a priority, but the Pakistani mediators were told a different story to secure the Iranian signature. This strategic ambiguity may have bought the world two weeks of time, but it has done so by creating a diplomatic collision course that will likely reach its terminus when the Islamabad talks begin on Friday. The fragility of the ceasefire is not just a matter of Iranian sincerity, but of whether the U.S. can effectively bridge the gap between its desire for a headline-grabbing peace and Israel's refusal to take a strategic loss on its northern border.

7. Cognitive Capacity and the Commander-in-Chief: The 25th Amendment Debate

The Mechanical Threshold of Section 4

The unprecedented events of April 7, 2026, have reignited a constitutional debate that has remained largely dormant since the transition of power in 2025: the invocation of Section 4 of the 25th Amendment. This specific provision allows the Vice President and a majority of either the Cabinet or a body designated by Congress to declare the President "unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office." Unlike impeachment, which focuses on "high crimes and misdemeanors," the 25th Amendment is a mechanism designed to address fitness, whether physical or cognitive. In the wake of the "Annihilation Doctrine" and the subsequent, whiplash-inducing ceasefire, proponents of this measure argue that the Commander-in-Chief's decision-making process no longer reflects a coherent strategic logic but rather a state of profound cognitive volatility. The debate centers on whether a President's public threats to commit mass civilian destruction, followed by a sudden reversal attributed to a foreign power's mediation, constitutes a functional "inability" to govern.

Rhetorical Volatility as a Diagnostic Indicator

The primary evidence cited by those calling for removal is the President's rhetorical arc throughout the day of the ultimatum. Critics, led by Senator Edward Markey and Representative Mike Quigley, point to the 6:45 a.m. social media posts as the baseline for a "delusional" shift in military policy. They argue that the transition from a focused naval operation to the public naming of civilian bridges and power plants as targets for "annihilation" represents a break from reality that jeopardizes global stability. This argument is supplemented by observations of the President's recent public appearances, where his speech patterns and rapid shifts in mood have been interpreted by some medical professionals—and many political opponents—as indicators of a deteriorating mental state. The NAACP's decision to join the call for removal further underscores the perceived severity of the situation, as the organization labeled the President's rhetoric not just as a policy failure, but as an irrational manifestation of power that threatens the safety of the republic.

Congressional Emergency Sessions and the "Unhinged" Allegations

As the two-week ceasefire begins, Congress is returning to Washington D.C. for what is expected to be a series of emergency hearings focused on the President's mental health. The "unhinged" allegations have moved beyond partisan talking points and into the realm of formal legislative inquiry. The House Judiciary Committee is expected to hear testimony from former administration officials and mental health experts regarding the "Madman Theory" of diplomacy versus actual cognitive decline. Proponents of the 25th Amendment argue that while "calculated unpredictability" was a hallmark of the President's earlier years, the 2026 Iran crisis

demonstrates a lack of the "impulse control" necessary to manage the nuclear triad. The emergency sessions will likely focus on the reports of the CENTCOM standoff, examining whether the military's hesitation was a direct result of their own assessment that the Commander-in-Chief was no longer making decisions based on sound intelligence or legal counsel.

The Role of the Cabinet and the Vice President's Prerogative

Despite the mounting pressure from the legislative branch and civil rights organizations, the invocation of Section 4 remains a high constitutional bar that requires the active participation of the Vice President and the Cabinet. To date, the Vice President has remained publicly steadfast in support of the President, framing the ceasefire as a masterstroke of diplomacy that avoided a wider war. For the 25th Amendment debate to transition from a congressional outcry to a legal reality, a "breaking point" must be reached within the executive's inner circle. This would require the Secretary of War and other high-ranking officials to conclude that the President's erraticism poses a greater threat to the nation than the political fallout of his removal. As the Islamabad talks approach, the Cabinet's observation of the President's private behavior during this high-stress period will be the deciding factor in whether the 25th Amendment remains a theoretical tool of the opposition or becomes a historic instrument of constitutional preservation.

8. Nuclear Brinkmanship in the 21st Century: Protocols and Pressure

The Threshold of 90 Percent: Iran's Weapons-Grade Status

The primary driver of the nuclear anxiety characterizing the April 2026 crisis was the intelligence consensus reached in late February regarding Iran's enrichment capabilities. Reports from the International Atomic Energy Agency, supplemented by Israeli and American clandestine intelligence, confirmed that the Fordow and Natanz facilities had successfully processed uranium to 90 percent purity. This weapons-grade status fundamentally shifted the conflict from a regional naval skirmish to an existential nuclear standoff. For the White House, this "red line" necessitated the launch of Operation Epic Fury, as the administration argued that a nuclear-armed Iran would permanently destabilize the global order and provide an umbrella of immunity for its regional proxies. The proximity of Iran to a deliverable warhead meant that any American strike—especially one targeting "civilization" infrastructure—carried the inherent risk of a desperate, "use it or lose it" nuclear response from Tehran. This environment of compressed decision-making time significantly increased the pressure on American command and control protocols, as the margin for error effectively vanished.

NC2 Safeguards and the Chain of Command

As the 8:00 p.m. deadline approached on April 7, the focus of global concern shifted to the Nuclear Command and Control (NC2) systems of the United States. Under existing U.S. law and military doctrine, the President has the sole authority to authorize the use of nuclear weapons. However, the process is not instantaneous nor purely unilateral in practice. It requires the cooperation of the "No-Lone Zone" personnel and the verification of the Secretary of War and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. During the 2026 standoff, rumors circulated that General Dan Caine had quietly reinforced the "consultative" nature of these protocols. While the President holds the "gold codes," the actual execution of a launch order involves a complex series of authentication steps through the National Military Command Center. The reported friction within CENTCOM and the Joint Chiefs suggests that the military establishment was hyper-vigilant regarding the "legal and rational" basis of any potential escalatory order, creating an informal layer of vetting intended to prevent an accidental or emotionally driven nuclear exchange.

The Madman Theory in the Nuclear Age

The April 7 ultimatum represented the most aggressive application of the "Madman Theory" of diplomacy since the height of the Cold War. By publicly threatening the total annihilation of Iranian civilization, the President sought to convince Tehran that he was willing to ignore traditional military proportionalities and risk a global catastrophe to achieve his objectives. This strategy relies on the adversary believing that the leader is sufficiently volatile or "unhinged" to follow through on a catastrophic threat. However, in 2026, this brinkmanship faced a unique challenge: the transparency of the domestic American opposition. As Congress and civil rights organizations publicly questioned the President’s mental fitness and discussed the 25th Amendment, the "credibility" of the threat was undermined. Iran’s leadership was forced to determine whether they were facing a calculated strategic gambit or a Commander-in-Chief whose orders might be countermanded by his own generals. This ambiguity created a "double-blind" scenario where both sides were operating under extreme psychological pressure with no clear indicators of the other's true intentions.

The "Two-Key" Logic and the Role of the Secretary of War

The role of Secretary of War Pete Hegseth during the final hours of the April 7 deadline was crucial to maintaining the appearance of a unified command. While the President is the sole authorizing official, the "Two-Key" logic dictates that the Secretary must verify that the order is indeed coming from the President. In the 2026 context, this verification process reportedly became a focal point for the "slow roll" accusations. If the Secretary of War or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs believed a launch order was illegal—due to it being a war crime under

international law or a violation of the principle of distinction—they would be placed in the same Command Paradox as Admiral Cooper at CENTCOM. The nuclear protocols of the 21st century are thus designed for speed but are ultimately tethered to a human chain of command that is increasingly sensitive to the legal and moral ramifications of total war. The April 7 crisis demonstrated that while the technology for annihilation is more efficient than ever, the human protocols meant to safeguard that power are under unprecedented strain from the intersection of executive volatility and international law.

9. Historical Precedents of Military Insubordination and Their Modern Echoes

The Rarity of Overt Defiance in American History

The principle of civilian control of the military is so deeply embedded in the American constitutional tradition that overt instances of a commanding officer refusing a direct order from the President are exceedingly rare. Throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the American military has largely adhered to a culture of disciplined obedience, where disagreements with executive policy are resolved through resignation rather than rebellion. However, the crisis of April 2026 does not exist in isolation. It is the latest and perhaps most acute manifestation of a historical tension that emerges whenever a Commander-in-Chief's strategic objectives appear to deviate from established military doctrine or international legal norms. By examining the bookends of American military insubordination—from the Civil War to the Korean War and the domestic turbulence of the 2020s—we can contextualize the reported actions of CENTCOM as part of a long-standing "Command Paradox" that forces officers to choose between the chain of command and their oath to the Constitution.

The MacArthur and McClellan Paradigms

The two most frequently cited precedents for the current standoff are the cases of General George B. McClellan during the Civil War and General Douglas MacArthur during the Korean War. McClellan's "insubordination" was characterized by a passive-aggressive refusal to engage the enemy, a tactic Lincoln famously termed "the slows." McClellan's defiance was rooted in a fundamental disagreement over the scope and purpose of the war, as well as a personal contempt for Lincoln's civilian leadership. In contrast, MacArthur's defiance was active and rhetorical. During the Korean War, MacArthur publicly challenged President Truman's strategy of "limited war," advocating instead for a total victory that included the use of nuclear weapons and an expansion of the conflict into mainland China. MacArthur's dismissal in 1951 solidified the executive's power to remove a popular commander for challenging policy, yet it also created a blueprint for the "charismatic general" who views his strategic wisdom as superior to that of the elected executive—a ghost that continues to haunt the Pentagon in 2026.

The Milley Precedent and the New Safeguard Culture

The modern echo of the April 2026 crisis finds its most direct ancestor in the actions of General Mark Milley during the final months of the first Trump administration. In 2021, reports surfaced that Milley had taken unprecedented steps to ensure that the military's chain of command remained a check on executive volatility. These included secret assurances to his Chinese counterparts that the U.S. would not launch a surprise attack and a meeting with high-ranking officers to insist that any nuclear launch orders must include his participation. While Milley's actions were framed by critics as a "deep state" mutiny, they established a new cultural precedent within the Joint Chiefs: the idea that the military establishment has a "safeguard" role when the President is perceived as erratic. The 2026 reports of Admiral Cooper and General Caine demanding written legal justifications for "civilization strikes" are a direct extension of this "Milley Precedent," where the military leadership views itself as a constitutional buffer rather than a passive instrument of executive will.

2026 and the Evolution of the Lawful Order

The critical difference between the 2026 standoff and its historical predecessors is the role of legalism. In the eras of McClellan and MacArthur, the debates were primarily strategic and political. In 2026, the friction is defined by the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the explicit "duty to disobey" an unlawful order. The firing of several top Judge Advocate General (JAG) officers earlier in the administration, combined with the dissolution of the Civilian Harm Mitigation and Response unit, created an environment where military leaders felt uniquely exposed to legal liability. Unlike MacArthur, who wanted more war, the commanders in 2026 reportedly sought to limit the war to stay within the bounds of the Geneva Conventions. This shift from "political insubordination" to "legal refusal" represents a fundamental evolution in how the American military interacts with its civilian leadership. The April 7 crisis suggests that in the twenty-first century, the most effective check on a Commander-in-Chief may not be a vote of no confidence in Congress, but a demand for a legal signature in the Pentagon.

From Insubordination to Constitutional Preservation

Ultimately, the historical record suggests that the American republic relies on a delicate, unwritten agreement between the President and the military: the President provides clear, lawful direction, and the military provides expert, loyal execution. When that agreement breaks down—whether due to a President's perceived cognitive decline or a general's perceived arrogance—the resulting friction creates a constitutional emergency. The modern echoes of past defiance suggest that the current crisis is the culmination of a century-long struggle to define the limits of the Commander-in-Chief's power in an age of total war. Whether the actions of CENTCOM will be remembered as a dangerous subversion of democracy or a heroic act of

constitutional preservation remains to be seen, but they undoubtedly represent a new chapter in the history of American civilian-military relations, where the law of war has become the ultimate final line of defense.

10. The Role of Congress in Preventing Unilateral Escalation

The Emergency Recall and the Joint Statement of April 7

The legislative response to the April 7 ultimatum was marked by a level of urgency not seen in the halls of Congress since the events of early 2021. As the 8:00 p.m. deadline for the "annihilation" of Iranian infrastructure approached, House Democratic leadership, led by Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries and Minority Whip Katherine Clark, issued a scathing joint statement characterizing the President's rhetoric as completely unhinged. The statement argued that the threat to eradicate an entire civilization shocked the conscience and required an immediate cessation of the current recess. Democratic leaders formally called on Speaker Mike Johnson to bring the House back into session to vote on a privileged resolution that would invoke the War Powers Resolution of 1973, effectively ordering a halt to all offensive operations against Iranian territory. This move was framed not as a partisan maneuver, but as a necessary constitutional intervention to prevent the executive branch from unilaterally plunging the nation into a global conflict.

Bipartisan Fracture: The Collapse of the Pro-War Consensus

One of the most significant developments during the twelve-hour standoff was the visible fracture within the Republican conference. While many GOP members initially supported the maximum pressure campaign, the explicit targeting of civilian infrastructure—described by the President as the Civilization Doctrine—proved to be a bridge too far for key constitutional conservatives. Senator Ron Johnson voiced public concerns regarding the morality and legality of destroying desalination plants and power grids, suggesting that such actions were out of sync with any established moral code. Perhaps the most startling defection came from former Trump loyalist Marjorie Taylor Greene, who publicly called for the President's removal via the 25th Amendment, labeling the threat of annihilation as evil and madness. This bipartisan pushback undermined the administration's claim of a unified domestic front and provided the legislative cover necessary for more moderate members to consider emergency measures to curtail executive authority.

Statutory Limits and the Power of the Purse

The congressional strategy for the emergency session of April 8 is centered on two primary levers of power: the War Powers Resolution and the power of the purse. Legislative drafts

circulating in the House Judiciary Committee aim to refine the definition of "hostilities" to include cyber-attacks and civilian-targeted strikes, ensuring that any application of the Annihilation Doctrine requires a formal declaration of war. Furthermore, there are discussions regarding an immediate freeze on funds allocated for the current Middle East operations unless the administration provides a detailed legal justification for its targeting list. By threatening to defund specific categories of kinetic action, Congress is attempting to reassert its role as the final arbiter of war, challenging the expansive Article II interpretations that have allowed the White House to bypass legislative oversight for the past thirty-five days of conflict.

Impeachment as a Preemptive Tool

The call for impeachment, led by figures such as Representative Mike Quigley and Senator Edward Markey, has evolved from a reactive measure to a preemptive tool of de-escalation. The argument presented to the House is that a President who publicly threatens war crimes and demonstrates signs of cognitive instability poses an immediate threat to the national security of the United States. Unlike previous impeachment inquiries that focused on past conduct, the 2026 proceedings are being framed as an emergency injunction to protect the nuclear chain of command. Advocates of this approach argue that the mere commencement of an impeachment inquiry during a time of war serves as a vital signal to the military establishment and international allies that the President’s authority is contested. This legislative "red line" is intended to embolden the "safeguard culture" within the Pentagon, providing officers like Admiral Cooper with the political backing necessary to continue their scrutiny of executive orders.

The Role of the Speaker and the Path Forward

The political future of the April 2026 crisis now rests largely on the shoulders of Speaker Mike Johnson. As the House gathers for its emergency session, the Speaker faces intense pressure from the White House to hold the line against "Democrat obstruction" while simultaneously facing a growing rebellion within his own ranks from members horrified by the prospect of a nuclear exchange. The Speaker’s decision to allow or block a vote on the War Powers Resolution will determine whether the two-week ceasefire remains a fragile executive whim or becomes a legally mandated period of diplomacy. As Congress debates the limits of the Commander-in-Chief's power, the world is watching to see if the American legislative branch can successfully reclaim the war power it has largely abdicated over the last century, or if the "Annihilation Doctrine" has permanently shifted the balance of power toward a unilateral executive.

11. Geopolitical Realignment: The Sino-Russian Response to US Volatility

Beijing's Narrative of the Rational Hegemon

The events of early April 2026 provided the People's Republic of China with a historic opportunity to accelerate its narrative of American decline and "strategic erraticism." Throughout the thirty-five-day conflict, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs maintained a posture of "principled neutrality," but the shift toward the Civilization Doctrine on April 7 prompted an immediate and coordinated rhetorical offensive. Beijing began framing the United States not as a stabilizing global leader, but as a "volatile nuclear actor" whose internal command structures were failing. By highlighting the reports of friction between the White House and CENTCOM, Chinese state media argued that the American system of governance had become a liability to global security. This messaging was specifically targeted at the "Global South" and traditional U.S. allies in the Gulf, suggesting that the American security umbrella was now more likely to incinerate its protected states than to defend them. In the eyes of Beijing, the 2026 crisis served as the definitive proof that the world required a "multipolar security architecture" where no single, unstable executive could threaten the existence of an entire civilization.

The Moscow Mockery: Exploiting the Chain of Command Crisis

In Moscow, the response to the April 7 ultimatum was characterized by a mixture of strategic opportunism and calculated mockery. The Kremlin utilized the reports of military insubordination within the U.S. to highlight what it termed the "implosion of Western institutional discipline." Russian leadership, long accused of being the primary source of global instability, sought to flip the script by characterizing the American President's "annihilation" rhetoric as the ultimate form of state-sponsored terrorism. Furthermore, Russia used the crisis to deepen its military cooperation with Tehran, reportedly providing advanced jamming technology and intelligence sharing during the 8:00 p.m. standoff. Moscow's goal was to ensure that even if a ceasefire was reached, the United States emerged with its reputation for internal cohesion shattered. The Russian narrative emphasized that the American "Deep State"—a term they repurposed to describe the military leadership at the Pentagon—was now effectively in a state of cold civil war with the executive branch, making the U.S. an unreliable partner in any future international treaty.

Pakistan as the Chinese Proxy and the New Diplomatic Axis

The role of Pakistan in the April 7 ceasefire is widely viewed by geopolitical analysts as a manifestation of Chinese diplomatic "shuttle power." While the mediation was fronted by Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif, intelligence indicates that the 10-point proposal was vetted and encouraged by Beijing. By utilizing Pakistan as the primary intermediary, China was able to

resolve the immediate threat of a nuclear-adjacent conflict without having to engage directly with an administration it views as fundamentally unpredictable. This "Islamabad-Beijing-Tehran Axis" represents a significant shift in regional power dynamics. The fact that the United States had to rely on a Pakistani backchannel—rather than its own traditional European or regional allies—to avert a "civilization-ending" strike demonstrates a profound erosion of American diplomatic leverage. For China, the ceasefire was a low-cost victory that stabilized its energy supply routes while positioning it as the "true" guarantor of peace in the Middle East.

De-dollarization and the Abandonment of the Security Umbrella

The long-term geopolitical consequence of the 2026 crisis is likely to be a rapid acceleration of de-dollarization and a strategic hedging by mid-tier powers. The threat of "annihilation" directed at a major energy producer like Iran sent a clear signal to other nations: their integration into the U.S.-led financial and security system offers no protection against sudden, unilateral executive decisions. In the days following the ceasefire, reports emerged of several Southeast Asian and Gulf nations opening discussions with Beijing regarding the transition of oil payments to the yuan. These nations are increasingly viewing the American "security umbrella" as a liability that invites conflict rather than deterring it. The Sino-Russian response has been to encourage this shift, offering "sovereignty-safe" security partnerships that do not carry the risk of total destruction based on the shifting moods of a single foreign capital. The "Command Paradox" in Washington has thus created a "Strategic Vacuum" globally, one that America’s rivals are moving quickly to fill.

The Schism in the Rules-Based Order

Ultimately, the Sino-Russian response has effectively declared the "Rules-Based International Order" dead as of April 2026. By threatening to target civilian infrastructure in a way that violates the Geneva Conventions, the United States has, in the eyes of its rivals, forfeited its moral authority to lead that order. China and Russia are now working to codify a new set of international norms that emphasize "non-interference" and "civilizational sovereignty," specifically designed to appeal to nations wary of American volatility. The 2026 Iran crisis may be remembered not just for the war that didn't happen, but for the geopolitical realignment that did. As the U.S. and Israel struggle to define what a "win" looks like in a ceasefire they largely see as a farce, the rest of the world is beginning to build an architecture that assumes the American era of predictable, centralized command is over.

12. Conclusion: Reevaluating the Safeguards of the Republic

The Legacy of the Command Paradox

The events of April 7, 2026, will likely be studied by constitutional scholars and military historians as the moment the American "Command Paradox" reached its logical and most dangerous extreme. For over two centuries, the principle of civilian control of the military was predicated on the assumption of a shared reality and a common adherence to international norms between the Commander-in-Chief and the professional officer corps. The 2026 Iran crisis shattered this assumption. When a President publicly tethers the use of the nuclear triad and the destruction of a civilization to a social media ultimatum, the military's role as a passive instrument of executive will becomes untenable. The reported friction within CENTCOM was not an act of traditional mutiny, but an allergic reaction of a rule-based institution to an order that bypassed the legal and moral filters of modern warfare. This paradox—where the military must choose between the authority of the President and the authority of the Law—now stands as the primary structural vulnerability of the United States.

The Ceasefire as a Symptom of Instability

While the world breathed a collective sigh of relief as the 8:00 p.m. deadline passed without fire, the resulting Pakistani Accord must be viewed with clinical skepticism. The ceasefire is not a product of diplomatic maturation, but a tactical byproduct of a breakdown in command cohesion. It is a "pause" born of exhaustion and confusion rather than a settlement of the underlying nuclear and regional issues. By claiming a "total victory" in a situation where his own generals reportedly hesitated to execute his doctrine, the President has created a narrative of success that mask a deeper internal rot. This disconnect between the White House’s perception of power and the Pentagon’s perception of legality ensures that the next two weeks will be a period of intense domestic maneuvering rather than genuine international reconciliation. The ceasefire is a farce in the sense that it solves nothing; it merely delays the inevitable collision between the President’s "Maximum Pressure" and the reality of a multipolar world that no longer bows to unilateral American threats.

The Road to the 25th Amendment and Beyond

As Congress returns to Washington to debate the mental fitness of the President and the potential for impeachment, the republic faces a reckoning that transcends any single administration. The 2026 crisis has proven that the current safeguards—the War Powers Resolution, the UCMJ, and the Nuclear Command and Control protocols—are heavily dependent on the "good faith" of individuals in the chain of command. The "Milley Precedent" and the "Cooper Refusal" suggest that the military has become the final, unofficial check on executive power, a development that is as terrifying as it is necessary. If the 25th Amendment is

invoked, it will be the first time in history that a President's strategic rhetoric is used as a medical diagnosis. This path forward is fraught with the risk of civil unrest and political fragmentation, yet many argue it is the only way to ensure that a future "Annihilation Doctrine" remains a rhetorical flourish rather than a scorched-earth reality.

A Republic if We Can Keep Its Commanders

The ultimate lesson of the April 7 standoff is that the speed of 21st-century warfare has outpaced the deliberative speed of 18th-century constitutional design. In an age of 90-percent uranium enrichment and hypersonic delivery systems, the nation cannot rely on a "slow roll" from the Pentagon to prevent a global catastrophe. The "Command Paradox" is a warning: the survival of the republic depends on a clear, legal, and cognitive alignment between the one who gives the order and the thousands who must obey it. As the Islamabad talks begin and the world watches the American legislature gather, the question is no longer just about whether the Strait of Hormuz will stay open, but whether the American experiment can survive its own executive volatility. The safeguards of the republic were tested on April 7; they held by a thread, but the thread is fraying, and the next deadline is only fourteen days away.

References

Associated Press. "The Latest: Trump pulls back on threats as US, Israel and Iran reach a 2-week ceasefire deal." April 8, 2026.

Associated Press. "Trump widens threat to all of Iran's power plants and bridges as his deadline for a deal approaches." April 6, 2026.

ClickOnDetroit / AP News. "Iranian pro-government demonstrators burn the U.S. and Israeli flags during a gathering after announcement of a two-week ceasefire." April 8, 2026.

Fox News. "Trump pauses Iran strikes for two weeks to negotiate 10-point peace deal." April 8, 2026.

Gulf International Forum. "Trump's Ground War Gamble in Iran." April 7, 2026.

KSAT / Associated Press. "The Latest: Trump brushes off war crime concerns as he repeats threat to Iran's infrastructure." April 6, 2026.

National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI). "Iran News in Brief – April 8, 2026." April 8, 2026.

The Hindu. "Iran-Israel war LIVE updates: Expect unimpeded global flow of commerce would prevail through Strait of Hormuz, says MEA on temporary ceasefire." April 8, 2026.

The Soufan Center. "Intelbrief: The U.S. and Iran Agree to a Two-Week Ceasefire." April 8, 2026.

The War Zone. "Iran Rejects Ceasefire Deal (Updated)." April 6, 2026.

The author has published over 5,200 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

'THE ANNIHILATION DOCTRINE'
8:00 P.M. DEADLINE
IRAN
MADMAN THEORY?
25th AMENDMENT NOW!
UCMJ ART. 90-92: LAWFUL ORDERS?
INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW VETTING
IRAN